

**FAMILY QUARRELS.—The Dispute Case.**—If any earthly picture will go to illustrate the infernal regions, in our opinion, it is one of those family broils which the reader will find fully depicted in the case we are about to detail. It makes no great difference whether such quarrels arise from unrequited affection, jealousy, dissipation, extravagance, drunkenness, or any other cause, from ill matched pairs.

Our readers will find this case alluded to on our first page, which will serve in part as an introduction. Fond as we know a large class of our readers are of listening to scandal and such recitals as the subjoined, we do not think it very profitable to publish them often, and hence do not often gratify this class of readers.

We observe that some of our brethren of the press are taking sides in this controversy between Dr. Jarvis and wife, rather prematurely, too, we think, when the case is on trial. We are free to express ourselves in one respect,—the quicker separated and the farther they are placed apart the better; and it would doubtless have been better for them to have separated years ago.

**To the Hon. General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, to be held at Hartford, on the first Wednesday of May, 1839.**

The petition of Sarah M. Jarvis, of Middletown, in said State, respectfully sheweth:—That on the third day of July, 1810, she was lawfully married to the Rev. Samuel F. Jarvis, now of said Middletown. Few have reason to anticipate from that sacred relation so much happiness, as in this instance. The condition of her husband has ever been favorable to enjoyment and usefulness. Possessed of an ample fortune, and belonging to a profession distinguished for usefulness, honor and domestic peace; he seemed to be blessed with every means to render his own family happy and respectable. But from an early period after they were united, until this day, her life has been one continued scene of wretchedness. She soon found to her very great surprise and disappointment, that Dr. Jarvis had a disposition wholly incompatible with domestic happiness. His spirit was tyrannical, and his temper towards her petitioner violent, reckless, and ungenerous. Without any just provocation he has often inflicted upon her cruel blows, and by his debasing and severe exactions, has humbled her in the dust. During this long period she has endeavored, from a wish to preserve the reputation of the family, and a secret hope of better days, fondly though faintly cherished, to confine her sufferings, as far as possible to her own bosom. But her life has become at last so hopelessly miserable, that she has been compelled to ask counsel of her friends, and, finally to seek relief from this Hon. General Assembly.—She will not undertake to give a detail of the numerous instances of personal violence she has suffered; but will relate a few as specimens of her character.

One Sabbath morning in the early part of their marriage life, while she was in a situation which required all his sympathy and tenderness, he struck her several times upon her temple with his fist, with great violence, by which she was thrown into such agony of pain and fear, as to require the attendance of an eminent physician.

Her head continued swollen for more than a week, during which time she was confined to her room and was never spoken to by her husband.

On another occasion, by the infliction of a similar blow, her eye became inflamed and bloodshot, and so remained for many days. In such cases, your petitioner has given no just cause of offence. She has often been amazed at the outrages he would perpetrate upon her for a single word spoken without the thought of giving him offence.

Thus, at a particular time, one little daughter, having accidentally let fall a drop of ink upon her book, Dr. Jarvis immediately seized the book, and struck the child in the face with such force as to send her crying from the room. Your petitioner under the influence of a mother's feelings, remarked that the punishment seemed too severe for the offence. Upon which her husband came in a great passion at her, and seized her by the nose, and laid and wrung that with one hand, while with the other, he beat her violently on the side of the head. For some time, a German female was employed in the family as governess of the children. An attention was shown her by Dr. J. which indicated a very improper partiality.

He was in the habit of waiting upon her to and from the table, giving her his arm, of walking and riding with her in public, and in short giving her that preference, and bestowing upon her those civilities which belong only to a wife, and a deprivation of which, especially when they are devoted to another, is calculated to render a wife broken-hearted. One evening as the petitioner was binding up the foot of her daughter, which had been burned, her son, then about sixteen years of age, whispered to her that the governess had received a lover into the petitioner's private apartment. She reproved the governess for it. Dr. J. and the governess were sitting together, reading German. He took the part of the governess, and with great violence of manner, indicating a paroxysm of anger, ordered your petitioner to leave the room.—Being engaged in finishing the application of the bandage to her daughter's foot, she did not immediately retire, whereupon her husband went into the kitchen, engaged a stout athletic man, by a promise to obey his orders whatever they might be, then brought him into the parlor, and pointing to the petitioner, told him to "take her out." As the cook seized the petitioner, her son sprang forward and said, "If you touch my mother, I will knock you down." Upon that his father grasped him by the collar, thrust him against the wall, and with the aid of the cook whom he called off from the petitioner, put him out of the door and locked him out.

Your petitioner, in the meantime, sunk with sorrow beneath a table near her daughter's feet.—Her husband and the cook then returned, and found her there; and her husband grasping one arm and the cook grasping the other, they dragged her by one along a brick floor through the hall and two rooms, and at the last dropped her insensible upon the floor of the apartment, calling for the women to take care of her. This occurred about 9 o'clock in the evening, in the month of January, when the weather was extremely cold. About midnight, he sent a message that unless she ceased weeping and went to bed, her son should not be admitted into the house. She obeyed immediately, and he let her in from the entry or passage way into the street, where all this time he had been at the door. He is since dead, and the memory of him has ever been associated with recollection of his sufferings.

ordered her to keep her own apartment, and locked her out from the room occupied by himself and the governess and the family.

He excluded her from his table for some weeks, and placed the governess at the head of it in her stead.

But it may not be necessary to go further into detail. His cruelties have continued to the present hour. They have been repeated during the past summer with peculiar aggravation, when her children have been witnesses of the humiliating scenes. For some months past she has been compelled to wear a bandage around her wrist from the effects of his violence in attempting to thrust her from the room in the presence of her children. He charges her, in their presence, with insanity; and tells her, that she is unfit to be their companion. He has given the charge of the family, and the keys of the house, to her second daughter, and installed her in authority over her mother.—He has abandoned your petitioner as a husband, having kept a separate sleeping apartment for many years.

As far as he could, without exciting observation he has declined all intercourse with her; refusing even to speak to her, except in the presence of company, or to minister rebukes. Although he is worth, as she has reason to believe, more than one hundred thousand dollars, he refuses her all supplies, except those of his table, at which she is permitted to sit in silent neglect; and her father has for a long time furnished her with the means of subsistence.

Even to the postage of a letter, the funds of her husband have been denied her. He told her about six months since, that there would soon be nothing for her in his house; for that matters were ripening to a separation; thus intimating that he should shortly turn her out of doors.

Indeed, she is no longer the wife of her husband, but is already divorced except by the forms of law. In addition to these domestic injuries, he has lately availed himself of his high standing as a scholar and a clergyman, and a man of wealth, to circulate most wrongful and injurious reports, for the purpose of turning against her the current of public opinion. These reports, from her retired and private station, she is wholly unable to correct with the publicity which they are circulated.

He has lately called together the female members of his church, and still more recently the male members, and in her absence, and without her knowledge, made her the subject of his reproaches. He thus seems determined to render her the object of public odium, and to deprive her of all sources of pity and consolation.

These outrageous and unmanly attacks upon her character and her peace, have reduced her to a state of wretchedness which can be endured no longer. Her only hope is from your Honorable Body. She therefore prays this General Assembly to take her case into consideration, and upon finding the facts herein stated to be true, to grant her a bill of divorce from her said husband; and to appropriate to her such a part of his property as is necessary, and proper and usual in such cases;—and to grant her the society and guardianship of her two youngest children;—and the petitioner, as in duty bound will ever pray, &c.

SARAH M. JARVIS.

#### Answer of Samuel F. Jarvis,

To the Hon. General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, now in session at Hartford, in said State.

The answer of Samuel F. Jarvis, of Middletown, in said State, to the petition of Sarah M. Jarvis, his wife, praying for divorce, respectfully sheweth:—That he was married to the petitioner on the 3d of July 1810; that he continued to reside in his father's family until the spring of 1811; that he then became the Rector of St. Michael's and St. James' churches on the island of New York; and that, in the summer of 1829 he removed with his family to Boston, where he became the Rector of St. Paul's church; that on the 5th of July 1835, he embarked with his family for Europe; that in February 1836 he returned from France; that on the arrival of his family in 1837, he provided a residence for them among his relations in Stamford; and that in February 1838 they joined him in Middletown, where, with the exception of his younger children who were placed at school, they have continued to reside till the present time.

The charges of the petitioner extend over this whole period of twenty-nine years. She accuses the respondent chiefly of cruelty arising from a tyrannical spirit, and a violent, reckless, and ungenerous temper; of charging her with insanity in the presence of her children; of showing improper attention to a German female resident in the family; of giving the charge of his family to his second daughter, of leaving a husband abandoned her for many years by keeping a separate sleeping apartment; and of not furnishing her with a proper maintenance.

The respondent hopes to satisfy your honorable assembly that all these allegations are either grossly exaggerated or entirely groundless.

**First Charge.—Cruelty.**—As to a tyrannical spirit, and a violent, reckless, and ungenerous temper, the respondent, in refutation of the charge, can safely appeal to all who know him. His union with the petitioner arose, on his part, from the most disinterested affection, though not on hers, as he believes, fully able to prove. Few men have loved with more ardor, and it is impossible that one whose whole life has exhibited kindness and gentleness towards all men, should tyrannize over, or treat with cruelty, the wife of his bosom. Surely the imputation is a libel upon his own character, for it must have required very bitter and continued provocation to turn patience into anger, kindness into cruelty, and gentleness into tyranny.

The petitioner affirms that "without any just provocation" the respondent has often inflicted upon her cruel blows, and by his debasing and severe exactions has humbled her in the dust." All this the respondent utterly denies.

In support of this general charge she proceeds to relate what she is pleased to call a "few specimens of the numerous instances of personal violence which she has suffered." The first, which is said to have occurred "one Sabbath morning, in the early part of their marriage life," but, as specified in the amended petition, "at Boston, on the 3d of April 1825," is a pure fiction. Not the smallest circumstance ever occurred, as far as the respondent recollects, which could give even a pretext for such a charge.

During the first 15 years of their married life, the petitioner was treated by the respondent with a degree of indulgence which, in the judgment of his friends, argued uxorious weakness. She was always of an unquiet disposition, perpetually given to change, discontented with present and real blessings, and eagerly grasping at those which were future and imaginary. The respondent continually endeavored to soothe these irritable feelings, submitted to her exactions, which were often unreasonable and contrary to his own ideas of propriety, and deprived himself of comforts that he might alleviate her sufferings or minister to her enjoyments.

The second allegation is, that "on another occasion, by the infliction of similar blows, her eye became inflamed and so remained for several days." This, in the amended petition is said to have occurred in Lyons. The whole charge the respondent avers to be false and unfounded.

The general charge of cruelty in Florence, if the respondent may be permitted to conjecture, has been built upon the following circumstance. On leaving Paris for Italy, he provided himself with two accurate thermometers exhibiting the three scales now in use, viz., the Centigrade, and those of Reaumur and Fahrenheit.—Knowing also his wife's fondness for frequent hot bath-

ing, and her necessity in adjusting the temperature of the bath, purchased for her a sensitive thermometer. This, it was found on their arrival at Florence, had been broken on their passage;—and he endeavored in vain to replace it. His wife then asked him for one of his thermometers. He replied that he was constantly making observations with them both; that they were not fit for her purpose, and would be spoiled by immersion in water. One day, at 3 o'clock, P. M., an hour in which he always noted the degree of heat, both the thermometers were missing. His family were at the dinner table, and suspecting for what purpose and by whom they had been taken away, he mildly asked his wife to give them up to him. She returned him no answer. He twice repeated the request. She continued silent, with a contemptuous toss of the head. On this, he told her that if she would not give them up, he must take measures to compel her to do so.

He then returned to his study which communicated to his bed-chamber, locking the door after him, and proceeded to fasten all the doors, so that she could not enter her bed chamber until she complied with his request.—Suspecting his intention, she ran round another way, and arrived just as he was closing the last door. Seeing that she was too late, she caught out of the nurse's arms her infant child, and presented it as a soldier would present arms in order that the respondent, if he closed the door, might hit the child's face. The respondent, with the palm of his hand, pushed back the child, and with his right leg kicked the door. He never even touched his wife; but she immediately put a bandage over one of her eyes, complaining before the servants that it was black and blue, bathed it continually with Cologne water, and kept it thus covered for a week.—after persevering for two days, as gave up the thermometers and the doors were immediately thrown open. The whole of this ridiculous farce was so evidently intended for effect, that it incurred the diversion of the servants, and all others possessed of the least penetration.

The respondent is obliged to add that, some time after, on going into his study he found both his thermometers broken.

Beside this event, the respondent knows nothing in the whole course of his life which the most inventive ingenuity could torture into any allegation of the kind now made.

3. The third specification is more definite, and the respondent is therefore able to state the facts with precision. In the year 1825, at Florence, a small, unbound book in the German language, containing the fables of Gallert, had been blotted by the respondent's daughter, at this time nine years old. The respondent reproved her for her carelessness and told her that she deserved to have her ears boxed. So saying, he tapped her gently on each ear with the open book. Any one who knows the spongy nature of German paper, will be convinced that even a smart blow could not have injured the child.

As it was, she could scarcely have felt it. The petitioner, however, often with unmeasured language. On this occasion she called him a tyrant, and used other abusive epithets, all calculated to destroy his influence. He had found from experience that any attempt to reply or to stop her tongue by entreaty, argument or authority, had no effect. Ridicule was the only successful method of relieving himself from her attacks. He therefore advanced towards her, and addressed her in a tone of no consequence, but which she mistook for anger, and indignation and anger, after a few minutes she started from her seat and left the room. The whole story of his coming at her in a passion, seizing and ringing her nose, and beating her on the side of her head with his clenched fist, is a fiction of her own brain.

4. As the next allegation is connected with the subject of the German governess, the respondent will reserve it till he comes to the charge of improper conduct on his part towards that respectable young lady. He now proceeds, therefore, to speak of what the petitioner has next asserted, "that his cruelties have been continued to the present hour," and "repeated during the past summer with peculiar aggravation." In support of this assertion (5) she states that "for some months past she has been compelled to wear a bandage round her wrist from the effects of his violence in attempting to thrust her from the room in the presence of her children." The petitioner, from the time of her arrival in this country, has exhibited a most systematic and determined opposition to the respondent on all subjects, but most especially that on which she knew him to be most sensitive—the government and education of his youngest child, and pointedly herself in Stamford; but less frequently and pointedly herself in Middletown. But from February 1825, the respondent was self in Middletown, until October of the same year, when he removed the children from home to distant schools, that opposition became in the highest degree violent and irritating. The respondent endeavored to bear it with patience, and to counteract its pernicious effects by mild measures. At times, however, his patience was exhausted, and on one of these occasions the following scene occurred. The family were at table, and the petitioner took that opportunity to insult the respondent with disrespectful and abusive language. On this he told his wife that he could not submit to be thus treated in the presence of his children, and that either she or they must leave the room. She refused to do this herself, saying, that whether her children were there she would be the respondent then turned to the younger children and told them to go to their room. On this the petitioner drew them towards her, and they came around them and thus prevented their obeying their father's orders. He felt that his authority would be gone for ever if he did not enforce his commands. He therefore took hold of his wife's wrist, separated her hands which she had clasped together, and having thus freed the children from her embrace, conducted them to the door. All this was done with determination, to release the children, and it is impossible that she should have sustained any permanent injury. The story of the bandage around the wrist must be placed on company with that of the bandage over the eye at Florence. Both were worn for effect, and both were so evidently absurd as to gain no credit among the members of her household.

The respondent freely admits that he has said to the petitioner that she was insane, but it seemed to him to be the only charitable construction to be put upon her conduct.

In 1825, an unhappy difficulty arose in his church, of which it is unnecessary now to speak, but which led to a dissolution of his pastoral connection with his people. The mortification which this occasioned to the proud believer, the recollection of those feelings which had been transient and evanescent. In 1830, a settled aversion towards her husband became evident, showing itself in a disposition to quarrel with him on the slightest occasions—to contradict him on every subject, whether important or trivial, and to wound his feelings in the presence of strangers, by the exhibition of contempt for his person. He habitually spoke slightly of the clergy, as being least prized by those who knew them best; and being least respected because he saw that he was annoyed by it—encouraged his children in disobedience to his commands—and in a word made him as miserable as she had once rendered him happy.

During the journey to Italy and Florence, her conduct bore the same strange and wayward character, as exhibited in the affair of the Thermometers, the catching up her child and holding it so that its head might be struck if the respondent closed the door of her chamber, and the bandage worn over her eye. She suspected people of crimes. On the slightest occasions she would accuse them of being cheats or thieves or impostors. Attachments to persons around her would be suddenly changed into the utmost contempt and aversion, servants who had been most unremitting in the care of her children were quarrelled with and discharged.

In the spring of 1829, the respondent removed to Siena, and on the 22d of December of that year, his horse fell under him and his right shoulder was dislocated.—From the time of arrival in Siena he had been the happy pastor of a congregation of English residents, beloved and respected by them, and as he had reason to believe eminently useful. The accident above mentioned prevented the usual services on Christmas day. On that morning, as he lay helpless in his bed, his wife, entered the room, and standing by the bed-side shook her clenched fist over him, exclaiming, "It is a judgment of God upon you. He knew that you were unworthy to minister at this altar, and therefore he has laid you here. He would not let you administer the communion to your people."

Early in February, 1830, the petitioner enclosed and sent to the wife of Dr. Grottanelli, an eminent physician, certain letters purporting to have been written at various times, and addressed to her water Ariella.—These letters were first to be shown to Padre Ricca, a man of great influence among the Italians, and then to be circulated among the English residents, who formed

the congregation of the Respondent. They were full of gross insinuations, bitter invectives, and direct charges of cruelty, but among other attacks occurred one in the form of an Appeal to her sister, as knowing the fact that the Respondent was a degraded clergyman.—"You know," said she, "that in his own country he was turned from the altar as unworthy to minister there."

In 1828, an English maid servant whom the petitioner had quarrelled with and discharged, said to the Respondent, "Sir, you little know what mischief says of you behind your back. She says that in your own country you were turned from the altar as unworthy to serve there." The Respondent then sent for his wife and told the girl to repeat what she had said in her presence. She did so, and the petitioner solemnly denied it. Yet in the letter circulated in 1830, the identical words appeared in her own handwriting, sent abroad among her parishioners and his Italian acquaintances, for the obvious purpose of destroying all his ministerial usefulness, and all the respect of the community. Happily, he had letters in his possession which showed the falsehood of the assertion; and being thus attacked, he felt himself called upon to defend his reputation, on all the points on which his wife had assailed it. The consequence was an acquittal, and a solemn declaration on the part of the English and Italian, that "this character had been put into the crucible, and like pure gold, had come out of the fire unharmed."

Some benevolent individuals, particularly Mr. and Mrs. Faulkner, and Dr. and Mrs. Grottanelli, feeling how dreadful would be the consequences to his family if some step should not be put to his wife's conduct, now interposed their mediation. They persuaded the petitioner to make concessions, they urged upon the respondent for the sake of his children to rest satisfied with verbal declarations from his wife, of her sorrow for having thus attacked him, and a verbal entreaty of forgiveness. He yielded because he wished not to appear unrelenting. A mutual promise was given that no communications should be made by either party to their friends in America, and her papers and his defence were both committed to the flames.

In March, the respondent went to Rome. During his absence, the petitioner broke open his trunk of papers, examined its contents, and took out such as referred to her own conduct. She had also attempted to send his eldest son to his father, contrary to what she knew to be the instructions left by the respondent. Happily, he heard of this plan just in time to prevent its execution. Justly displeased at this conduct, the respondent made it known to the friends who had interposed their kind offices, and they again attempted the labor of reconciliation. They again effected it; and the respondent, on receiving her declaration of sorrow for her conduct, consented again to receive her to his bosom. She spoke of herself as being in a state of suffering and requiring both for herself and the younger children, who had the whooping cough, a change of air.—The respondent immediately engaged lodgings at Leghorn, ordered his house in Siena to be shut up, and sent her to his family to join him. On their arrival, he received her to his own language, as the best of husbands would receive the best of wives.

For two months this happiness continued without abatement or interruption. She became mild, courteous, and studious to promote his wishes and administer to his comfort. This gave him the greatest delight, and he began again to encourage the hope of permanent happiness.

But in the month of October, after their return to Siena, a letter arrived from Charles Sigourney, Esq. of Hartford, from which it appeared that rumors had crossed the Atlantic, and that in Boston reports were in circulation unfavorable to the moral character of the petitioner as well as the respondent. On showing this letter to Mr. Faulkner and Dr. Grottanelli, both agreed that it must be answered. Both consented to write to Mr. Sigourney, and both advised that the respondent should also write with the knowledge and consent of his wife. He accordingly did so. The respondent drew up a letter which Mr. Faulkner and Dr. Grottanelli approved, but which did not please the petitioner. The respondent then told her that, as he had solemnly promised, he never should write any thing without her consent. He therefore requested her to alter the letter as she liked.—She did so, and he sent it precisely in her own words. From this time forth, however, he observed in her a more determined manner, which showed him that her mind was ill at ease. He regretted this, and endeavored by kindness to bring her back to the same cheerfulness and sweetness of manner which she exhibited before the arrival of Mr. Sigourney's letter.

She now became very anxious to leave Siena; and therefore in January 1831, the respondent removed with his family to Rome. There it was necessary to live on a more expensive scale than at Siena. The respondent hired a London and pair of horses at the rate of eighty dollars a month. He then requested his wife to unite with him in making an estimate of the expenses, and she would make her enlarged allowance as he had done in Siena. His object was to induce her to practice economy for her own sake, because the more she saved, the more she would have for her own private expenditure. To his great surprise, she at once burst from all the restraints to which she had agreed in Siena, refused to take any responsibility for the household, and launched out into expense beyond the capacity of his income to sustain. The respondent submitted to an evil which he could not avoid, and this submission prevented an explosion of extraordinary ill-humor on the part of his wife until the arrival of his family in Bologna. Here, in the autumn of 1831, the petitioner betrayed, in a moment of extreme irritability, the important fact, that contrary to her solemn promise with her family, and her also had been writing to certain of the American Bishops with the view of injuring the respondent. The reconciliation which had been so happily begun, was fatally terminated. The respondent demanded the letters to the Bishops to be given up to him, and expressed his determination, if they were not, to return to Siena. To his great surprise, she replied that she had written to Mrs. Faulkner, and Mrs. Grottanelli to ask their advice. They both said that she had violated her solemn promise, that she ought not only to give up the letters, but also never to carry on any correspondence without the knowledge and consent of her husband. The letters being given up, the respondent remained that winter in Bologna, endeavoring though in vain, to make to himself a more cheerful home. On his return to America, he was informed to his great surprise, that she had not only written to her own family, but also, the friends of her husband. Thus, while he abstained in good faith from uttering one syllable of the wrongs he had endured, she was endeavoring secretly to undermine the affectionate confidence of his nearest and dearest friends.

[Concluded next week.]

#### Important from Florida.

##### THE WAR ENDED.

From the Charleston, S. C. Courier, May 27.

We are at length able to make this oft repeated and oft delusive announcement, in good earnest. Maj. Gen. Macomb arrived here, this morning, in the steamer Cincinnati, from Jacksonville, East Florida, having made the definite pacific arrangement contained in the general orders. The arrangement made by the commanding Gen. is as wise as well as humane one. It will be better to leave the slow but sure influence of advancing civilization to relieve Florida of the remnants of her savage inhabitants, than further to prosecute a war, at the cost of millions, in order to expel a handful of Indians from inaccessible hammocks and morasses.

From the Globe.

It gives us great pleasure to announce the arrival at the seat of government of Major Gen. Macomb, who has succeeded in pacifying the Indians of Florida, and has made such an arrangement with them as will effectually put a stop to the further effusion of blood in that territory. The country to be occupied provisionally by the Indians, is situated beyond all former settlements, and the cordon of posts established across the peninsula from New Smyrna to Tampa Bay will be furnished with a sufficient number of troops to ensure the faithful observance of the terms dictated by Gen. Macomb, both by the whites and the red men.

Late despatches received from Fort Gibson announce that Gen. Armstrong had, in pursuance of instructions from the Secretary of War, made an

arrangement for the future permanent settlement of the Seminoles, perfectly satisfactory to the citizens of the Territory, and to the Seminoles now in the West were about to retire there.

#### GENERAL ORDER.

Head Quarters of the U. S. Army, Fort King, Florida, May 15, 1832.

The Major-general-commander-in-chief has the satisfaction of announcing to the army in Florida, to the citizens of the Territory, and to the Seminoles, that he has this day terminated the war with the Seminoles Indians, by an agreement entered into with Chitto-tustunugge, principal chief of the Seminoles, and successor of Ar-pe-ke, commonly called Sam Jones, brought to this post by Lieut. Col. Harney, of the 2d dragons, from the southern parts of the peninsula.

The terms of the agreement are, that hostilities immediately cease between the parties, and that the troops of the U. S. and the Seminoles and Muskogee chiefs and warriors now at a distance, be made acquainted as soon as possible with the fact that peace exists, and that all hostilities between them are to cease on both sides; the Seminoles and Muskogees agreeing to retire into a distant country in Florida below Peas Creek, the boundaries of which are as follows, viz., beginning at a most southern point of land between Charlotte harbor and the Coloosahatchee or Sayville river, as posite to Sayville Island, thence into Charlotte harbor by the southern pass between Pine Island and said point, along the eastern shore of said harbor to Talak Chopko or Peas Creek; thence up said creek to its source; thence easterly to the northern point of Lake Itapoga; thence along the eastern outlet of said lake, called Itapoga creek, to the Kissimmee river; thence southwardly through said lake to Okechobee; thence south through said lake to Eeshlahatchee or Shark river; thence down said river westwardly to its mouth; thence along the sea shore northwardly to the place of beginning; that sixty days be allowed the Indians north and east of that boundary to remove their families and effects into said district, when they are to remain until further arrangements be made, under the protection of the troops of the U. S., who are to see that they be not molested by traders, citizens or foreigners, and that the said Indians do not pass the limits assigned them, except to visit the ports which will be hereinafter indicated to them. All persons are therefore forbidden to enter the district assigned to said Indians, without permission from some commanding officer of a military post.

ALEX. MACOMB, Maj. Gen. Com. in-Chief.

By command of the General, E. SCHUYLER, B. A. General.

#### VERMONT WHIG STATE CONVENTION.

Arrangements should be made in every town to send one delegate at least. But the expense is urged as an objection to going. This surely should not be overlooked; nor should this or that man, be more active than his neighbor, and more patriotic too, be called upon to do more than his share in attempts to preserve from the withering blight and contamination of Van Buren Toryism the institutions of our State. But what shall be done, it is asked? Do as our opponents did last winter. Let the Whigs of each town make up a purse to the amount of the necessary expenses of a journey to Woodstock, and depute one of their number to represent their wishes in the Convention. This is but justice, and a full delegation can thus be obtained without imposing an onerous burden upon individuals. They should also express their wishes freely to their delegate, that he may act for the people, and not in obedience of certain leaders, as do our opponents.—The Custom House officers make nominations for the Van Buren party;—our nominations must come from the people. Is there a town of any magnitude in this part of the State that will fail to send a representative to the proposed Convention? We hope not. We append the following well timed remarks from the Franklin (St. Albans) Messenger.—*Caledonian.*

"As Vermont has been, so let her continue to be, always faithful." This is the prayer of every true Patriot and Republican who has lived under its salutary and benign government. As he looks abroad among the sister States, he finds that most of them have so often changed that he can place little reliance upon them. Not so with his own State. She is not wafted about by every "wind of doctrine." Her principles remain firm and immovable as her mountains and pure as her crystal streams; the principles of modern misnamed democracy as exemplified by the present national administration party, have never shaken the one not polluted the other. She has persevered through all the storms of adverse fortune elsewhere, un dismayed and unconquered, in the support of Republican principles, and steadfast opposition to Executive usurpation and misuse. Can we now expect that she will falter? Her motto is "ONWARD." Relying on the intelligence and virtue of its freemen, she will continue to be true and faithful, defying, hurling back with indignation, every trick and device of the enemy to make her bow the knee to the Baal of Loco Focoism.

Great efforts are now being made by the friends of the Administration to recover their lost strength in this State they will make an unprecedented effort to carry the next election next fall. If their principles were as commendable as their devotion to party, triumphant success would await them.—"Though as a general thing democracy will triumph, it is sometimes true that its enemies do succeed by their vigilance, fraud and treachery. It behooves us to be on our guard, watch closely the signs of the times, and if we would prosper, elect men to office, who will rescue our nation from the grasp of spoils-men and demagogues—who will do away with the dangerous principles of concentrating power in one man; who will keep and cherish as a sacred trust those principles, bequeathed to us by the Whigs of the Revolution. As Vermont was in the Revolution, may she continue to be, TRUE and FAITHFUL.

It has been reported in town for the last week, that his Excellency, Sir George Arthur has resigned the government of Upper Canada, and that his resignation has been accepted. It is further stated that the Hon Fox Maule is to come out as successor to Sir G. Arthur. Mr Maule is the eldest son of Lord Panmure, and nephew of the late Earl of Dalhousie, sometime Governor General of British North America, to whose staff Mr Maule was attached as aide-de-camp; and during Lord Grey's administration, he filled the office of an under Secretary of State. He is at present a member of the House of Commons.—*Toronto Colonist.*